

THE CRITIC AND GUIDE

(Formerly *FILLERS*)

EDITED BY *Ed Haldeman-Julius*

THE F.B.I.--THE BASIS OF AN AMERICAN POLICE STATE

THE ALARMING METHODS OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

By CLIFTON BENNETT

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1948
By E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of America

I. THE ORGANIZATION

Tommy-guns held in hair-trigger readiness, the Federal Agents waited for the signal of their leader. In the darkness ahead, they heard a stealthy footstep, then another. A group of men took shadowy form. The leader of the G-Men spoke sharply, commandingly.

"Halt! Stand where you are and put up your hands!"

"Put 'em up yourself."

"Halt, I said—this is the F.B.I."

"Halt, yourself. This is the Indiana State Police."

Repeating a familiar pattern, the G-Men had failed to notify State Police that they would be operating in the area. As a result, each group mistook the other for the Dillinger mob, and were ready to shoot it out at the drop of a fingerprint.¹

Hunting down Dillingers has provided the Federal Bureau of Investigation with most of the romantic publicity that has gone into the making of countless front pages, movies and comic books glorifying the G-Men. Such crime-chasing, however, is not the whole story.

Known at its founding in 1908 as the Bureau of Investigation, the organization grew slowly until 1924, picking up bits of additional power along the way through passage of the White Slave Traffic Act of 1910, and the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act of 1919. The Bureau took its present form in 1924 following the connection of Attorney General Daugherty and Bureau agents with the Teapot Dome oil scandals and the American Metal Company manipulations under the Harding administration.²

The new Attorney General, Harian F. Stone—later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—appointed J. Edgar Hoover Director of the re-organized Bureau, with orders to clean it up, introduce promotions on merit and eliminate political influence. Mr. Hoover did all these things and many more, with the sure instinct of a master showman for anything that would put more power in the hands of his organization.

In 1924, there were not more than 600 employees in the Bureau. The Federal Budget for 1948 provided for more than 10,000. In 1924, there were 810,188 fingerprints in the records. Today there are more than 103,020,000. In its first year of operation under Hoover, the Bureau spent slightly over \$2,000,000. It cost less than \$50,000,000 for the whole 15-year period, 1924-1939. The 1948 Budget calls for that amount for one year, after Hoover's share of the Government-employee which-burning is added to the figures.

The greatest period of F.B.I. growth came under the Roosevelt administration as part of the New Deal trend toward federal power. The setting up of the Social Security files provided the F.B.I. with a convenient cross-check on their growing fingerprint collection. Contrary to popular belief, the Social Security records are available to the Bureau, and have been extensively used by them. Universal fingerprinting, one of J. Edgar Hoover's most enthusiastic projects, is well under way with a majority of Americans already neatly filed for future reference. Beginning in 1939-40, the War Department, Navy Department and Marine Corps filed prints of all incoming personnel with the Bureau. Prints of workers in war industries added to the collection; and in 1940 the Alien Registration Act further swelled the personnel ranks, the power of the Director and the Budget estimates.

II. THE SPECIAL AGENT

The age of the average G-Man is 34. He must be a graduate of a recognized law school or a member of the Bar, with at least two years of legal or business experience; or he must be a graduate of a recognized accounting school with three years of commercial accounting or auditing experience. In practice these requirements have been considerably relaxed in recent years.

The G-Man's starting wage is about \$65-70 a week and his finishing wage is not much higher. Leon G. Turpin, one of the few men in the Bureau who managed to get some of the publicity usually conferred by Hoover, was earning \$4,500 a year as one of the oldest and most trusted Special Agents at the time of his "separation with prejudice" over articles written by him for a newspaper chain.

G-Men, who prefer to be called Special Agents of the Department of Justice, are usually recruited through the regular publicity of the Bureau, or through speakers sent to address popular classes at law schools. It is claimed that approximately one out of a thousand applicants is ultimately accepted into the Bureau. They have a high degree of personal loyalty to the Bureau Director.

University degrees are held by approximately 78 percent of the men, who must attend a 14-week training school at Quantico, Virginia, and at the Washington headquarters. J. Edgar Hoover and four other persons make up the regular faculty. Listed as a Visiting Faculty Member is J. P. Allman, Commissioner of the Chicago Police at the time of the Memorial Day Massacre in 1937, whom Philip Murray charged with the murder of the seven Republic Steel strikers. Commissioner Allman is presented as a specialist on "Parades, Assemblies, and Emergencies."

The F.B.I. booklet on "Training Schools and Selection of Personnel," which provides us with this information on the varied requirements and education of a G-Man, also tells us that:

"The diversified qualifications are very important, particularly when the records of the Bureau reflect instances wherein an expert violinist was able to soften the heart of a mountaineer with his music and cause him to disclose the whereabouts of his son, who was a fugitive from justice."

The younger and more recently acquired Special Agents are a much smoother set of operators than the City Detective. They rarely resort to the use of force in questioning. Criminals refer to them as "super con-men."

In addition to their use of "psychology" in place of the third degree, many F.B.I. operatives are marked by a youthful amateurishness and over-dramatization of their role. A recent example is the wire-tapping case involving Harry Bridges.

Section 14, Manual of Rules and Regulations of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, as issued June 17, 1930, reads:

"Wire tapping, entrapment, or the use of any illegal or unethical tactics in procuring information will not be tolerated by the Bureau."

This section appeared in the Manual since 1923, and Director Hoover displayed admirable familiarity with the publications of his Bureau when questioned by Rep. Tinkham before a subcommittee on December 2, 1929. He stated:

"We have a very definite rule in the Bureau that any employee engaging in wire tapping will be dismissed from the service of the

Bureau. While it may not be illegal, I think it is unethical and it is not permitted under the regulations by the Attorney General."

The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee reported on the same question that "wire tapping, dictographing and similar devices are especially dangerous at the present time, because of the recent resurgence of a spy system conducted by government police. Wire tapping and other unethical devices may have the effect of increasing the power of law enforcement agencies to oppress factory employees who are under investigation, not for any criminal action, but only by reason of their views and activities in regard to labor unions and other economic movements. This is no fanciful case—such investigations are a fact today."

Justice Brandeis, writing a minority opinion on the Olmstead case, reported that "the evil incident to invasion of the privacy of the telephone is far greater than that involved in tapping with the mails. And it is also immaterial that the intrusion (wire tapping) was in aid of law enforcement. Experience should teach us to be most on guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding."

With that background on wire tapping, let us see what happened to Harry Bridges, shadowed because of deportation proceedings. After finding evidence that his hotel telephone had been tapped, and establishing the presence of two Federal agents in the room next to his, he turned the tables on them by trailing them to Foley Square. F.B.I. headquarters where they submitted their report. Bridges took a good pair of field glasses and some witnesses to the top of a building opposite his hotel and described the occasion:

"I spotted my room at the Edison easily enough with the field glasses because I had left some suit on the window sill which I could recognize. Then I moved the glasses over to the room next to mine and there were the two guys stretched out on the twin beds with their earphones on, thinking I was still in the room."

"Well, so we would tear up old letters and things and the next morning leave them in my room at the Edison, and then that afternoon would see one of the F.B.I. men sitting at the table at the window in his room pasting little pieces of paper together. A couple of times I longed things up in the shape of a row of paper dolls. Then we'd see this F.B.I. guy holding up the stars and the row of dolls next day at the window studying them."

In spite of all the pretty talk about ethics, wire tapping was nothing new in the life of an F.B.I. agent. Ten years prior to the Bridges incident, Rep. Clardy told the House of Representatives:

"It was Mrs. Wilberandt (Assistant Attorney General) who put spies and agents of the Department of Justice from the Pacific Coast to watch high Federal officials of the Treasury Department in Michigan. I am told on good authority that it was she who ordered the tapping of telephone wires of the highest Federal official of Michigan, the Collector of Customs."

All of this without any knowledge on the part of the Attorney General or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of course.

Following the Pearl Harbor fiasco, J. Edgar Hoover, found negligent in the Roberts Report, contended that his agents had been out-stinted by the Japanese because they did not have the right to tap wires. No ethical considerations seemed to be bothering him at the moment, and Congressman Celler rushed to oblige with a bill which would put the OK on Federal wire tapping, but failure to obtain Congressional sanction

didn't bother J. Edgar or his agents, who kept right on tapping wires right and left.

According to the 1948 Budget, there were 7,201 of these wire-tapping Federal Sherlocks with "diversified qualifications" in the field, backed by another 3,580 departmental employees. That doesn't include the full personnel needed to carry out President Truman's Executive Order against subversives in government employment.

III. THE DIRECTOR

At George Washington University, J. Edgar Hoover committed The Perfect Crime. Although the Office of the Registrar will affirm that he did attend a night school law course, obtaining an LL.B. in 1916 and LL.M. in 1917, there is no other visible record of his passage. According to the university library, he wrote no thesis for either degree. And the annual classbook for his year was omitted because of a financial crisis. At the library of the College of Law, however, there is a fat folder containing all the major speeches made by the Bureau Director over a period of 10 years, one copy of each having been sent most conscientiously to the librarian of his alma mater.

John Edgar Hoover, born in Washington, D. C., January 1, 1895, has spent most of his life right there. Product of a home atmosphere which seems to have been religious fundamentalist to the extreme, he still reflects his early training for the clergy in speeches and articles on crime, patriotism and the American Home.

At Central High School, "Speed," as he was nicknamed, became captain of the cadet corps and valedictorian of his class. Although the smallest boy in his cadet company, it has been claimed that during drill he displayed the loudest voice in the school.

At the University, he showed great interest in athletics, particularly baseball, and became head of the Kappa Alpha fraternity chapter. William Caxton, the actor, who stayed at the fraternity house, remarked that "Speed" chastised us with his morality." He was what Horatio Alger would have called a model of young American manhood.

Hoover has a phenomenal memory and a machine-gun delivery in speaking. He is said to suffer acute stage fright prior to a talk, but the violent content of his speeches fails to indicate any sign of it. He is obsessed by a persecution complex which shows up in many of his addresses.

On the radio, in his office is a framed sentiment entitled *The Penalty of Leadership*, which undoubtedly reflects his own attitude:

"In every field of human endeavor, he that is first must perpetually live in the white light of publicity. . . . When a man's work becomes a standard for the whole world, it also becomes a target for the shafts of the envious few."

Most of Hoover's time in Washington since 1917 has been spent in the Department of Justice Building, where he started as a file clerk. It is doubtful that he could meet his own requirements for Bureau agents, unless a clerking period with the Congressional Library can be stretched into "two years of legal or business experience," and a night school law degree sans thesis be transformed into a college education.

In the Department of Justice, he was first connected with wartime counter-espionage, and advanced by 1919 to direct the General Intelligence Division of the Department. This is the Division which was ordered disbanded when the Daugherty scandals revealed its use as a political police.

In 1921, Hoover was Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation, then headed by William J. Burns. As a Special Assistant to Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, Hoover gave a hand to the notorious "Red Raids" of the early '20s, in which over 6,000 persons were jailed on warrants secured from the Department of Labor. That is, some of them

were jailed on warrants. In other cases, the formality of a warrant was dispensed with.

Among the sinister meetings raided was one in New England called to plan for the establishment of a cooperative bakery. In Boston, several hundred prisoners were paraded through the streets in chains to afford dramatic material for the news photographers.⁸

Describing one of the raids made by Department of Justice agents, a sworn statement backed by over 100 witnesses sketches the brutal attack on the Russian People's House in New York City, made on November 7, 1918:

"The Department agents had a few warrants for the arrest of supposed offenders, but upon entering the building they tore off and broke up the stair railing, arming themselves with bludgeons thus made, and went through the whole building, breaking up all the different classes engaged in educational work . . . and broke up and destroyed all the furniture in the place, including desks and some typewriting machines. They beat up the persons in the place . . . and herded the students to the stairways, beating them as they went, shoving them off the landings on to the stairway in such a manner that many fell and rolled down the stairway . . . the Department agents beating them as they fell . . ."

In defense of J. Edgar Hoover, it has been said that his part in the raids consisted solely in carrying out the orders of his superiors. That sort of defense, however, was not good enough to save the lesser Nazis during the Nuremberg War Guilt trials. Moreover, it can be shown from sworn statements and from records of the Bureau, that J. Edgar Hoover knew more about what was going on than Palmer himself, and that Palmer had to keep Hoover by his side throughout questioning by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, referring to him constantly for the facts desired.

The main point of contention between the Senate investigators and the Department of Justice was the manner in which warrants for search and arrest were issued and used. The testimony shows that this was precisely the field in which Hoover had full responsibility:

"Senator WALSH: How many search warrants were issued?"

"Attorney General PALMER: I can not tell you, Senator, personally. If you would like to ask Mr. Hoover, who was in charge of this matter, he can tell you."¹⁰

Mr. Hoover, who had previously displayed a really amazing grasp of everything that had gone into the making of the raids together with the legal background and responsibilities of various government departments, here developed an obliging lack of memory.

A letter signed by Frank Burke, as Chief of the Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to George E. Kelleher, Division Superintendent of the Boston Branch, Bureau of Investigation, names Hoover as the raid coordinator at headquarters in Washington, and also outlines the manner of raiding:

"I have already transmitted to you two briefs prepared in this department upon the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party. . . . at the appointed time you will be advised by me by wire when to take into custody all persons for whom warrants have been issued.

"It is . . . of the utmost importance that you at once make every effort to ascertain the location of all of the books and records of these organizations in your territory and that the same be secured at the time of the arrests . . ."

"Particular efforts are to be made to apprehend all of the officers of either of these two parties if they are aliens; the residences of such officers should be searched in every instance for literature, membership cards, records and correspondence. The meeting rooms should be thoroughly searched . . . All literature,

books, papers, and anything hanging on the walls should be gathered up; the ceilings and partitions should be sounded for hiding places. "I have made mention above that the meeting places and residences of the members should be thoroughly searched. I leave it entirely to your discretion as to the methods by which you should gain access to such places."

"Under no conditions are you to take into your confidence the local police authorities or the State authorities prior to the making of the arrests."

"It possible you should arrange with your undercover informants to have meetings of the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party held on the night set. This, of course, would facilitate the making of the arrests."

On the evening of the arrests, this office will be open the entire night, and I desire that you communicate long distance to Mr. Hoover any matter of vital importance."

"I desire that the morning following the arrests, you should forward to this office by special delivery marked for the Attention of Mr. Hoover, a complete list of the names of persons arrested. In cases where arrests are made of persons not covered by warrants, you should at once request the local immigration authorities for warrants. I desire also that the morning following the arrests that you communicate in detail by telegram, Attention of Mr. Hoover, the results of the arrests made, together with a statement of any interesting evidence secured."

Memoranda from Special Agents for use in defending Palmer's handling of the raids were also addressed to Mr. Hoover. Some of the charges of illegal practices by the United States Department of Justice, made by the Popular Government League and American Civil Liberties Union, included:

1. Cruel and unusual punishment.
2. Arrest without warrant.
3. Unreasonable search and seizure.
4. Use of agents provocateur.
5. Compelling persons to witness against themselves.
6. Influencing public opinion in advance of court action.

Summarizing the attitude of the judiciary toward the raids, Federal Judge Anderson said:

"I refrain from any extended comment on the lawlessness of these proceedings by our supposedly law-enforcing officials. The documents and accounts speak for themselves. . . . I cannot adopt the contention that government spies are any more trustworthy, or less disposed to make trouble in order to profit therefrom, than are spies in private industry. A right-minded man refuses such a job."

The public speeches and writings of J. Edgar Hoover are lurid, alarmist and imaginative, with a regard for fact that is almost on a level with the best of Nick Carter. For example, in an address to the Sheriffs' Association, at Tulsa, Oklahoma, January 13, 1936:

"Prisons are being emptied. . . . Through this exercise of clemency the law-abiding person becomes all but powerless to escape the predatorial actions of vicious human vultures. . . . It seems beyond the range of human conception that boards of clemency would meet in secret sessions and undo, with the stroke of a pen, the work of fear-less law-enforcement officers, the judgment of honest and efficient courts, the desires of the American populace itself, and throw open prison doors to hordes of sneering, desperate convicts whose sole purpose is again to flout the law. . . . Should they again be apprehended, convicted and sentenced, the angels of mercy, who so love freedom for convicts, and who so forget the innocent and suffering public, will gently minister to their every desire and soon again throw the locks that will usher them forth to freedom."

From this it is reasonable to suppose that a battalion or two of paroled convicts had been shooting up the scenery. Yet the F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin for the first three months of 1935—a fairly representative period—listed 90,504 arrests for various crimes, of which only 9059 percent were arrested during parole period. Of the 1,535 arrests for homicide, not one was shown to be on parole.

Some of Hoover's juicier epithets are aimed at "fiddle-faced reformers," "fantastic schemers," "sob-sisters," "convict lovers," "slutty legislators," "convict-indulging theorists," "criminal coddlers," "crackpot politicians," and "sentimentalists." The Director's favorite tag for an opponent is "sentimentalist." His number one adjective for the same is "foul."

In order to let the man speak for himself, representative excerpts from several of his speeches follow. Hoover is always on the side of the practical and hard-headed, be it noted, and against the visionary and the theorist. Practically every speech consists of a set of statistics showing how many murderers are lurking among each 103 persons in the audience, an exhortation against parole reformers and crooked politicians who keep harassing Mr. Hoover, and a wind-up appeal for God, Country, and The Good Old-Fashioned American Home.

July 9, 1935, to the International Association of Chiefs of Police:

"Indeed, it would seem that such enemies were numerous enough and deadly enough without the addition of even a vast army of antagonists. . . . I refer to the 'sob-sisters,' the intruders, the uninformed and misinformed know-it-alls, the sentimentalists and the alleged criminologists who believe that the individual is greater than society, that because any criminal can display or simulate even the slightest evidence of ordinary conduct, then indeed he must be a persecuted being, entitled to be sent forth anew into the world to again rob and plunder and murder. . . . I refer to the countless thousands of unregenerate criminals who, through the subversive acts of convict lovers, have been turned loose to prey anew upon communities of defenseless because the law-enforcement machinery has been lulled into the belief that these men were still in prison when in truth they have been secretly released to again go forth upon a new series of depredations."

May 20, 1936, to the Boys' Clubs of America Convention:

"This is what usually happens when the F.B.I. eradicates what I prefer to call not 'public enemies' but 'public rats'. Each of them has a great gathering of sentimental yammerheads, who utter re-monstrances at his apprehension and detection. So long as that asinine behavior continues, I insist that the crime problem as affects youth today is also a crime problem involving the moronic adults of this country."

"The sentimental theorists who dominate present-day child guidance, however, believe that if a child is chastised it may develop inhibitions or affect its later self-expression. So long as we fail to recognize that discipline is an essential part of human development just so long will we have an aimless, directionless milling herd which can only result in mental panic and a thorough disregard for the rights of society to peace and order. . . . I hope you look upon me as old-fashioned in the holding of such beliefs."

April 23, 1936, to the Daughters of the American Revolution:

"Were crime to marshal its forces in a marching body of men, they would tramp ceaselessly past this hall hour after hour, in daylight and in darkness and back to daylight and darkness again."

"Not to alarm you, but for your information, there are today in America, 150,000 murderers roaming at large. (Arthur C. Mullanbach of Brookings Institution, citing *Uniform Crime Reports*, covering 987 of the largest cities, showed that police knew of only 647 cases

of criminal homicide not closed by arrests.) Statistics show that during the lifetime of those who form our population, 200,000—nearly a quarter of a million persons will commit murder before they die and more than 300,000 persons—the population of an entire metropolis—will be murdered. Consider that!

And so, I tell the stark truth to you women, who are known for your devotion to the country for which your forefathers gave their blood, and ask, in the name of those sacrifices, that you do your utmost to rekindle a spirit of determination and of self-sacrificing alertness that the loyalty to America the fidelity to ideals, and the unflinching courage which gave us Bunker Hill and Valley Forge may be reestablished.

There can be no weeding out of noxious growths until the roots which feed these growths are torn from the filthy muck which fosters them. . . . You will learn that the sob-sisters will soon come forth from hiding with cries of persecution against these dear, good boys. . . . You will discover that crackpot politicians. . . . will scuttle out from the shadows to add crime upon crime by evoking new and impossible schemes for the alleged eradication of the law-breaker. You will be surrounded by theorists, pseudo criminologists, hyper-sentimentalists.

Therefore, I warn you to stay unwavering to your task—that of standing by the men on the firing line—the practical, hard-headed, experienced, honest policemen who have shown by their efforts that they, and they alone, know the answer to the crime problem. That answer can be summed up in one sentence—adequate detection, swift apprehension, and certain, unrelenting punishment. That is what the criminal fears. That is what he understands, and nothing else and that fear is the only thing which will force him into the ranks of the law-abiding.

These persons of the under-filth are not simply poor boys or moral invalids as the super-sentimentalists would have you believe. They are marauders, who murder for a headline, rats crawling from their hide-outs to gnaw at the vitals of our civilization. . . . their standards of life are those of pigs in a wallow, their outlook that of vultures regurgitating their filth.

It was apathy which permitted the sentimentalists to make their creeping approach, to build beautiful stories about the sweet, dear convicts, who so loved freedom that they raised canary birds in cages, or placed the picture of some dear old mother upon the walls of their cells. These convict-lovers built beautiful romances about this foul offspring of our national filth.

"We need some good, old-fashioned American housecleaning of the kind that will rip off the dirty hangings and let in the light, that will beat out the floor coverings and sweep away the filth which has accumulated through the years of lethargy. Beyond that, we need the old-fashioned influence of the old-fashioned home."

"I am sick of the maudlinisms of fanatics and tuff-heads, who believe that the way to educate the new youth is to allow the new youth to do anything it pleases."

"I would not have you conclude that this picture is painted. . . . by a victim of. . . imagination. On the contrary, it is sketched against a background of stark statistics."

The words "filthy," "filth," and "foul" applied to convicted persons and to the other real or imagined opponents and persecutors of J. Edgar Hoover appear 10 times in this one speech. For refreshment after wading through this stuff, it is good to read the words of another lawyer, Clarence Darrow, in "Resist Not Evil," published by Haldeman-Julius in 1925. The ideas may be hard to agree with, but the entire tone and attitude is on a level of human intelligence and kindness that makes Mr. Hoover look like something out of the *Marquis de Sade*.

Hoover again, June 21, 1930, to the U. S. Junior Chamber of Commerce:

We of the FBI, have placed so much stress on detection and apprehension which, together with certainty of trial and punishment, constitute the time-proven deterrents to crime.

"America needs your patriotic zeal and your services in a crusade to insure her destiny on the chartered sea of Democracy. . . . Remember that from dawn this morning until dawn tomorrow morning, 3,928 major crimes will have been committed, including 33 homicides, 814 burglaries, 162 robberies, 2,258 larcenies, 22 rapes, 515 auto thefts and 122 aggravated assaults."

September 23, 1940, to the National Convention, American Legion: "From across the seas have come emissaries from totalitarian governments, seeking to undermine our Nationalism and to implant their doctrines of hate. . . . Ever on the alert to capitalize on popular trends, they have joined reform organizations and civil liberties groups, and have played dominant roles in some of the pacifist blocs. Action is necessary to prevent the bloodstream of America from contamination. . . . In this, the American Legion has set the pace. The necessity for its program, scorned and ridiculed by the Communists and their fellow-travelers, has been thoroughly established. . . . The American way of living will endure only as it is proved to be efficient."

"A vital test of Americanism is the revival of the pioneer spirit of our ancestors. As a people, we have become soft."

June 9, 1941, at the University of the South Commencement: "Shocking as it may seem, there is a murder in our United States every 44 minutes; a major felony every 21 seconds. . . . Was this the kind of nation for which Washington fought at Valley Forge?"

That word liberalism is something we should weigh carefully during these dark days that confront our nation. There is nothing more cowardly than a criminal; he works in the dark, he sneaks upon you in the shadows; he hides his gun under his coat until the moment when he would terrorize you. . . . Is there not a strange connection between such persons and certain apostles of degenerate dictators who, hiding their hammers and sickles under the protection of our national emblem, advance upon us in sham cloaks of all, while in reality plotting to trample beneath their blood-stained boots the very document which has been their greatest protection, our sacred Constitution of the United States!"

March 29, 1941, to the National Police Academy:

"The rabble-rousing Communist, the goosestepping Bundsman, their slogoes and seemingly innocent 'fronks,' and last but not the least, the pseudo liberals, adhere to the doctrine of falsification and distortion."

May 10, 1942, at Notre Dame University Commencement:

"One task before college graduates today is to apply their intellectual curiosity to exposing the motives of those who preach a foreign 'ism' instead of good old-fashioned Americanism."

"We have been engulfed with all kinds of new theories, holding that self-expression should not be disciplined. . . . It is a lack of religious training in the home, and the school, that usually breeds criminals."

From "Persons in Hiding," by J. Edgar Hoover:

"A child is a little animal to be guided into a necessarily false animal existence we call civilization, or to revert to more dreadful inclinations."

For his April 23, 1936 speech to the D. A. R. and similar super-bested contributions to American education, Hoover has been awarded 15 honorary degrees by George Washington University, Kalamazoo College, Pennsylvania Military College, Oklahoma Baptist University, et al. He has also received the World Award of the Camp Fire Girls.

The "criminal army" speech is one of Hoover's favorites. On September 19, 1936, during a speech to the Convention of Holy Name Societies, the Director set its USA division at \$3,500,000. By October 4, 1937, when he presumably had a larger audience to impress at the New York Herald Tribune Forum, it had picked up some recruits and grown to 4,300,000. On December 11, 1945, Hoover addressed the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Representatives from other lands were present, and it may thus be possible to excuse Mr. Hoover for his enthusiastic desire to impress these visitors with our unequaled depravity. He declared that we harbored a "criminal army" of 6,000,000.

Together with this picture of skyrocketing crime, J. Edgar gives us his solemn word that "detection and apprehension . . . together with certainty of trial and punishment, constitute the time-proven deterrents to crime." With the Bureau 20 times larger than it was in 1924, one would hardly expect to find that the "criminal army" had doubled in size. One might think the Bureau had slipped up somewhere. It is necessary to read the speeches of J. Edgar Hoover to learn about the soft-hearted parole boards, the corrupt politicians, and the errant parents who go about zealously undoing the work of the F.B.I.

At least one of Hoover's "criminal army" speeches sketched such a fantastic picture of American crime that it was reprinted under a double-column headline in the Russian Army newspaper Red Star on December 23, 1945. In this speech, he submitted statistics on the "juvenile spearhead" of the criminal army which included thousands of vicious characters charged with "drunkenness" and "driving while intoxicated." In a statement to The New York Times of October 18, 1946, Hoover fingered the troublemakers. "The most dangerous crime element," he declared, "is the juvenile delinquent." He blamed errant parents.

With the warming up of the anti-Russian campaign, Mr. Hoover discovered that the real threat no longer wore dobby socks and adored Sinatra, but sported a beard and throbbed to Shostakovich. One of his most recent pieces on the subject, "Red Fascism in the United States Today" in the American Magazine for February, 1947, tells America that "the Red scourge of Communism . . . is boring its way through our land like a termite." And so on, with plentiful quotes from pamphlets and manifestoes, all somewhat dog-eared after 20 years of thumbing from Hearst editorial writers. The performance is repeated in Newsweek for June 9, 1947.

Hoover's salary as Director and sole Publicly Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is \$13,846, modest as Federal salaries go. In 1925, it was \$7,500. He was once suggested to succeed Kansas' Mountain Landis as Baseball Commissioner, but turned down the job in spite of the fact that it would have paid him more than his berth with the Justice Department.

His personal morality is unimpeachable, to the point of being outstandingly odd. The only woman with whom he has been seen in public is Shirley Temple—at the time, she was 8 years old. Hoover is single, lives alone in Washington. Until his mother's death in 1938, he lived with her. It is probably true that he has refused to accept pay for the numerous magazine and newspaper articles funneled from the Bureau under his name.

IV. THE F.B.I. DOSSIERS

Among the dangerous radicals at one time shadowed by the Bureau, and included in their political information file, is former President Herbert Hoover. Other prominent Americans who have been honored by inclusion in the dossiers are Justice Stone, Senator Wheeler and Senator Borah.

The dossiers which J. Edgar Hoover's men, during the Red Raids,

had compiled on the two Boston anarchists, Sacco and Vanzetti, were largely instrumental in sending them to the electric chair. The dossiers were relied on heavily by the prosecution in fabricating the pretrial judicial frame-up in history. They were never produced in court, despite repeated efforts of the defense attorneys, who had reason to believe they contained material (suppressed by the prosecution and the F.B.I.) which would help clear the defendants.

In connection with cooperation between the District Attorney and the Department of Justice on the Sacco-Vanzetti Case, G-Man Fred G. Weyand stated:

"Institutions were received from the Chief of the Bureau of the Department of Justice in Washington from time to time in reference to the Sacco-Vanzetti case. They are on file or should be on file in the Boston office.

"The understanding in this case between the agents of the Department of Justice in Boston and the District Attorney followed the usual custom, that the Department of Justice would help the District Attorney to secure a conviction, and that he in turn would help the agents of the Department of Justice to secure information that they might desire. This would include the turning over of any pertinent information by the Department of Justice to the District Attorney. Sacco and Vanzetti were, at least in the opinion of the Boston agents of the Department of Justice, not liable to deportation as draft dodgers, but only as anarchists, and could not be deported as anarchists unless it could be shown that they were believers in anarchy, which is always a difficult thing to show. It usually can only be shown by self-incrimination. The Boston agents believed that these men were anarchists, and hoped to be able to secure the necessary evidence against them from their testimony at their trial for murder, to be used in case they were not convicted of murder. There is correspondence between Mr. Katzmann and Mr. West on file in the Boston office of the Department. Mr. West furnished Mr. Katzmann information about the Radical activities of Sacco and Vanzetti to be used in their cross-examination.

"What I mean is that I think they did not believe in organized government or in private property. But I am also thoroughly convinced, and always have been, and I believe that is and always has been the opinion of such Boston agents of the Department of Justice as had any knowledge on the subject, that these men had nothing whatever to do with the South Braintree murders, and that their convictions was the result of cooperation between the Boston agents of the Department of Justice and the District Attorney. It was the general opinion of the Boston agents of the Department of Justice having knowledge of the affair that the South Braintree crime was committed by a gang of professional highwaymen."

Another Special Agent, Lawrence Leithman, stated:

"The Department of Justice in Boston was anxious to get sufficient evidence against Sacco and Vanzetti to deport them, but never succeeded in getting the kind and amount of evidence required for that purpose. It was the opinion of the Department agents here that a conviction of Sacco and Vanzetti for murder would be one way of disposing of these two men. It was also the general opinion of such of the agents in Boston as had any actual knowledge of the Sacco-Vanzetti case, that Sacco and Vanzetti, although anarchists and agitators, were not highway robbers, and had nothing to do with the South Braintree crime. My opinion, and the opinion of most of the other men in the Government service, has always been that the South Braintree crime was the work of professionals.

"The Boston agents of the Department of Justice assigned certain men to attend the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti, including Mr. Weyand. Mr. West also attended the trial. There is or was a great deal of correspondence on file in the Boston office between Mr. West

and Mr. Katzmann, the District Attorney, and there are also copies of reports sent to Washington about the case. Letters and reports were made in triplicate; two copies were sent to Washington and one retained in Boston. The letters and documents on file in the Boston office would throw a great deal of light upon the preparation of the Sacco-Vanzetti case for trial, and upon the real opinion of the Boston office of the Department of Justice as to the guilt of Sacco and Vanzetti of the particular crime with which they were charged."

Mr. Thompson counsel for the defense, sought to obtain access to the files mentioned. Mr. Dowd, then in charge of the Boston office of the Justice Department, stated that he could not allow the files out of his possession, nor permit access to them, and that those were his instructions. The dossiers compiled by J. Edgar Hoover's General Intelligence Division were never disclosed by either the Boston office or the headquarters at Washington.

The Washington headquarters of the F.B.I. is a cross between a wax museum of horrors, a Shinto shrine, and a shooting gallery. One of the gadgets for the edification of persons in the waiting room is an illuminated meter which clicks up a new total every time a new fingerprint is added to the files. The Bureau has two classes of fingerprint files: criminal and non-criminal. The latter includes a large part of the adult population, since all armed forces fingerprint records are sent to the Bureau. It has been charged that when a print comes in on a criminal case, the civilian as well as the criminal files are transcribed. The criminal files themselves, which supply Mr. Hoover with sociological basis for his startling figures on the "criminal army," are shown together in a haphazard way as the following portion from an interview by the author on April 14, 1947, with Special Agent Wick of Division 4, Records and Communications, will reveal:

Q. During my tour through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, our guide said that one out of every 23 Americans had a criminal record, and his fingerprints are on file here. Now, did he mean that a great many are included who committed only minor crimes?

A. Anything more serious than a traffic violation is included. Q. Just where would I go to find a list of those offenses which are included? How would I know what is considered more serious than a traffic violation?

A. Well, you would have to go through the State records or perhaps the Federal archives.

Q. Let us take, for example, a man arrested for picketing. Is that considered more serious than a traffic violation?

A. There are many factors that would enter into that.

Q. But it might vary. One State would consider the offense a crime and the other would not?

A. It is up to the local police department whether or not the prints are sent in. It depends on the local law officers.

Q. So you have on file as criminals persons whose prints would not even be sent to you from some states, because the offense is not considered serious enough for fingerprinting perhaps?

A. Generally, traffic violations are left out. The local law determines.

"John Doe" is a journalist who, for obvious reasons, prefers to remain anonymous. He has supplied the following affidavit regarding the F.B.I. dossiers:

There are very few Americans who have seen their own dossiers in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I saw a copy of mine in 1942 and it frightened me—not only for myself but for thousands of others with similar records.

I had gone to work in Washington for one of the wartime agencies. One day the chief, whom I had known for many years, called me into his office. "Here's something I oughtn't to show you," he said. "The F.B.I.

sent over your record and its highly confidential. But I thought I'd bring the rule for once and let you see it, so that you'd know exactly what they were going to bring against you."

"Can I take it to my desk?"

"Yes, if you don't tell anyone about it and bring it back this afternoon."

I'm sorry now that I didn't take full notes on it, with transcripts of the more interesting passages. My record was a document of about thirty pages of single-spaced typing. Only the last few pages had anything to do with the F.B.I. investigation, then under way, into my fitness to endorse government paychecks; by the time that investigation was finished, it must have filled a volume. The document I saw was, for the most part, merely the dossier of a private citizen who, at the time the material went into the record, had never dreamed of working in Washington. Query to Mr. Hoover: How many private citizens who never belonged to the Communist Party or any other organization regarded by sensible people as subversive have dossiers in your files?

I wasn't even a prominent citizen. I had worked for a magazine, had let my name be used on the letterheads of several Communist-front organizations, had spoken at many of their meetings, had resigned from everything with a Communist tinge after the Russo-German pact, and was thereafter abused in the Communist press. That was my actual story and the F.B.I. had documented parts of it, while omitting everything about the resignations or the abuse. I began to suspect, and later became certain, that it wanted only what it regarded as incriminating evidence. One man spoke well of me, and the F.B.I. investigator looked away with a bored air. "But don't you know anything suspicious about him?" he finally interrupted.

Nothing in the dossier dealt with my activities before 1935, although I had been at my reddest or pinkest during the Hoover administration. The omission didn't mean that the F.B.I. recognized any statute of limitations; once it began to work on a case, it tried to trace a man's activities straight back to the womb. But it was handicapped in its search because it hadn't begun to function as an effective Thought-control Police until midway in Roosevelt's first term.

Besides the omissions in my dossier, there were a great many inclusions best described as fanciful. I was described as a prominent member of organizations I had never heard of—if they ever existed—and as a speaker at meetings I hadn't attended. One "informant" had seen me at a secret Communist Party conference—I was never present at anything of the sort—in a city which I had never visited. This same "informant," whom I judged from the context to be some illiterate ex-Communist bent on earning a few government dollars by bringing more and more names into his testimony endowed me with a long list of "close associates." The names he mentioned were strange to me, with one exception, that of "Mary Heaton Forster," whom I guessed to be Mary Heaton Forster.

The "informants" were not identified, but I recognized at least two of them by the phrasing of their testimony. One was a man whose last book I hadn't admitted and he expressed some doubt of my loyalty to the democratic way of life. Another was a man with whom I had had political arguments; he accused me of being a "transmission belt" for Moscow.

During the next few weeks I became obsessed with the desire to set the record straight. I had decided to resign from government service, but I didn't want to leave Washington while this mass of errors and allegations remained in the F.B.I. files, to be used I didn't know how. I went to see various officials and asked their help in obtaining a hearing. Once I thought the request was granted: I was told to appear at F.B.I. headquarters. Undistinguished young men in undistinguishable dark suits and gray snapbrim hats were going in and out the door, as anonymous as bees. I was directed to a little office, put under oath by two of the

young men, and asked for brief answers to half a dozen questions. Then I was told to sign my name.

"But aren't you going to ask me any more questions?" I said.

"No, that is all."

I began to feel like K— in Kafka's "The Trial." I went to see high officials in the Department of Justice to press for a hearing. To one of them I made the obvious remark that most of the F.B.I. investigators seemed pretty stupid. "Of course," he said. "You don't expect us to get *brilliant* law-school graduates, do you, for \$65 a week? I learned something about the sociology of the F.B.I. its investigators, who have to have law-school training are for the most part either Southerners or Catholics. Southerners are in the majority, but the Catholic influence is very strong, and some of the investigators are confused in their minds as to whether they are bounding down political or religious heresies. The word 'atheist' often occurs in their reports."

My little story would not have been worth telling except that it is presumably not an isolated instance. Its only special feature is that I had the privilege of seeing what the F.B.I.'s informants had said about me. What have they said about you, Reader? If you ever joined a Communist-front organization during the 1930's, or ever signed a petition, or ever received a government paycheck or ever had unsuspected enemies, you might be surprised at the material about you in the F.B.I. file, which is probably the largest collection of typewritten material in the world, and certainly the greatest collection anywhere of unverified, unsupported, unidentified, wild stories about anyone and everyone.—JOHN DOE.

V. PUBLICITY OR EFFICIENCY?

John Edgar Hoover has a flair for publicity that would make Barbara Hutton, Errol Flynn and Viljo Marcellinotto curl up with envy. Someone has remarked that Hoover may not be a crack shot with a gun, but nobody alive can beat him to the draw with a telephone.

Until 1940, most of the sensational magazine publicity was ground out by one Courtney Ryley Cooper, a former circus press agent turned Wild West pulp writer, who became semi-official Boswell to the Bureau. Most of the articles signed by Hoover before that time contain the notation, "ed. by Courtney Ryley Cooper." In the polite language of the literary world, Cooper would have been called Hoover's ghost-writer.

Mr. Cooper, nine years older than Hoover, had a considerable influence on the writing of his protegee. In fact, the style of Courtney Ryley Cooper is the style of John Edgar Hoover. A review of one of Cooper's books on the circus from the *Boston Transcript* reads as though it might have been a review of Mr. Hoover's 1936 speech to the D.A.R.:

"Mr. Cooper writes as if he were still press agent, glorifying the tented world just as his managers would have done, but not always with entire regard for actualities. A circus is always expected to exaggerate, perhaps the literature of the circus may be pardoned if it too is written with hyperlatives."

The F.B.I. Director rewarded Cooper for his collaboration by furnishing him with material for a number of books on crime. The Bureau also acquired Cooper on a one-year tour of American houses of prostitution which resulted in another book, *Designs in Scarlet*.

It is not surprising that such long and intensive cooperation between the two men should have resulted in the adoption by Hoover of Cooper's way of expressing himself, which has been described as "the vituperously sarcastic, 'no-nonsense-about-me' style of an experienced *Saturday Evening Post* contributor." Their close cooperation is preserved for posterity in two books: *Persons in Hiding* by J. Edgar Hoover, foreword by Courtney Ryley Cooper, and *Ten Thousand Public Enemies* by Courtney Ryley Cooper, foreword by J. Edgar Hoover.

Some of Hoover's publicity stunts incidental to furthering the P.P.I. into a replica of the 101 Ranch Show surpass the fantastic.

When Lepke Buchalter, wanted for murder and narcotics violations, one night gave himself up to Walter Winchell and J. Edgar on a New York street corner, the public was asked to believe that a stirring radio plea by Winchell at the request of Hoover had brought him in. According to other information, the whole business was handled through a "confidential informant" who got the word to Lepke that unless he handed himself over, somebody bigger would get hurt. Lepke also claimed at a later date that he had been promised a light sentence and had been double-crossed. Since the murder charge was a New York affair, and narcotics were not under the jurisdiction of the G-Men there is some doubt which loophole Hoover came in through.

When Victor (The Count) Lustig, famed counterfeiter, cut his way out of a utility room at the West Street Federal Detention Headquarters, where he had originally been placed by operatives of the Treasury Department, he eluded re-capture for a short time. Finally, he was again picked up by the Secret Service, who put the Count securely in irons. On their way back, they met the G-Men just starting out on the trail. Under standing instructions of Mr. Hoover, the G-Men immediately got on the telephone for Washington and reported the capture to The Chief. Mr. Hoover lost not a second in transforming the capture into screaming headlines—without mention of the Treasury Department men. Agents of the Secret Service and Post Office Inspector Service have made frequent complaints that "in scores of cases . . . their men have built up the evidence and located the criminal only to have the F.B.I. step in for the kill and credit."

When Harry Brunette was tear-gassed and machine-gunned out of a New York apartment with newspaper publicity and damage to adjoining apartments running about equal, Police Commissioner Valentine charged that the F.B.I. hungry for exclusive press coverage, had started the raid in violation of an agreement with New York police, thereby losing an opportunity to trap Brunette's confederate at the same time. Complaints against F.B.I. lack of cooperation have also come from the police forces of Chicago, St. Paul, Salt Lake City, New Orleans, and Seattle.

Hoover's publicity led most people to think the Bureau had solved the Lindbergh kidnapping case. Actually, the arrest of Hauptmann was primarily the work of Frank Wilson, Chief of Secret Service, who devised an intricate system of checking serial numbers on the ransom bills.

Hoover's publicity indicated that the Dillinger case had been cracked by the F.B.I. But the first time Dillinger was picked up, a local sheriff got him; the second and last time, two members of the East Chicago police force furnished the information on his whereabouts. To get Dillinger and Baby-Face Nelson, the G-Men paid a price of seven peacocks officers killed, one civilian killed and four wounded (during the escape of the gang from a bungled Federal round-up at Spider Lake, Wis.)

At least one American encyclopedia credits Hoover and the F.B.I. for solving the kidnap-murder of the Cash child in Florida. The kidnapper, Franklin Pierce McCall, was arrested by the local sheriff, released by the G-Men, and re-arrested two days later when they failed to find any other solution than Sheriff Coleman's.

The F.B.I.'s proudest wartime boast was the rounding up of the six German saboteurs who landed on the coast of Long Island. But it has now been revealed that this involved no feat of sleuthing more complicated than answering the phone. After the war was ended, and long after Hoover had grabbed front-page headlines for his "brilliant" and "vigilant" police work, Attorney-General Clark told the real story. Although the Coast Guard detected the landing almost as soon as it was made, the F.B.I. got nowhere until, six days later, Dasch, the expedition's leader, called them up and arranged to betray his comrades. (See *New York Times*—inside page, of course—for November 8, 1945.)

Hoover's publicly claims a high rate of convictions, but *Crime Control by the National Government*, published by the Brookings Institution, credits the G-Men with only 72.5 percent convictions in their arrests, which is the next to lowest rating of the seven major Federal law-enforcement agencies.

Notably in the case of John Dillinger, the F.B.I., under orders originally formulated by Attorney General Cummings in May, 1934, adopted a "shoot on sight and shoot to kill" policy in serious criminal cases. Dillinger's only known Federal offense was the transportation in interstate commerce of a stolen automobile, yet Joseph B. Keenan, Assistant Attorney General, could say: "I don't know when or where we will get him, but we will get him and I hope we get him under such circumstances that the government will not have to stand the expenses of a trial."¹⁹

As Howard McClellan shows in a *Harper's* article, credited crimes (those not proved against a suspect, but credited) are marked off the list of unsolved crimes when the man credited for them is killed or a suicide. When Dillinger was wiped out, a series of bank robberies in several states, including some committed simultaneously, were crossed off as solved. The habit of shooting a suspect and building up a good case against him later at leisure, can obviously be used in any situation where "public opinion" has been sufficiently aroused against the individual in question—whether or not he is accused of a crime carrying the death penalty.

The Hearst papers are unfailing in their support of Hoover's methods. They, and other publications which have scrupulously avoided any word of criticism aimed at the F.B.I. have been rewarded by advance tips, scoops, exclusive coverage. The critical publications get nothing; letters to the Bureau or to Hoover requesting interviews do not even receive the courtesy of an answer.

This method of rewarding the faithful has brought sharp protests from newspapers left out in the cold. One of the better known instances is the *Shantling Farnsworth* case. Farnsworth, a former naval officer, attempted to sell the confidential story of his activities as a spy in the United States to one Fulton Lewis, of Hearst's International News Service. Lewis turned over the suspect to the F.B.I. The Bureau rewarded him by giving him complete details on the case, which it withheld from all other news services. Hearst got a scoop on the story—hours ahead of all newspaper rivals.²⁰

VI. INSIDE THE F.B.I.

The General Intelligence Division, political police section of the Bureau, was originally organized by J. Edgar Hoover. In 1919 under A. Mitchell Palmer. Although the Division was theoretically disbanded after the Daugherty scandals revealed its use as a political weapon, the compiling of dossiers on radicals was continued and the Division revived in effect by Roosevelt's Executive Order of September 8, 1939 to investigate "subversive activities." What is considered subversive by the Bureau becomes apparent when former fingerprint classifiers report that some of the headings under which prints are filed read, "plocketer" and "union agitator." The F.B.I. once told a Senate committee that it had given extensive scrutiny to Bolsheviks and referred to the American Civil Liberties Union as an example of a Bolshevik organization.²¹

The type of work done by the Division under Hoover, Burns and Daugherty was made public through the attempt to frame Senator Wheeler, who had pressed investigation of Attorney General Daugherty and the Bureau's share in corruption under the Harding regime.

"When Wheeler started his drive against Daugherty, the latter consulted with Burns and Lockwood (Secretary, Republican National Committee). Burns has admitted that Daugherty suggested they 'get

Wheeler" and Burns confesses that he sent government agents out to Montana to see what they could dig up against the Senator. . . . The resignation of William J. Burns as Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice is attributed here to his part in the framing of the Wheeler case. . . ."²²

On November, 1939, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Hoover stated that he had organized a General Intelligence Division, which had "compiled extensive indices of individuals, groups and organizations engaged in these subversive activities, in espionage activities, or any other activities that are possibly detrimental to the internal security of the United States."

The indices have been arranged, says Mr. Hoover, "not only alphabetically, but also geographically, so that at any time . . . we would be able to go into any of these communities and identify individuals or groups who might be a source of grave danger to the security of this country. These indexes will be extremely important and valuable in grave emergency."

Here we have the secret behind Mr. Hoover's opposition to the outlawing of the Communist Party. The time is not quite ripe for wholesale arrests on a "geographical" basis, and he prefers that the Communists be permitted to exist legally until the proper pitch of hysteria permits a repetition of the Palmer Red Raids. Those who make the blunder of reading a flowering liberalism into purely tactical approaches on Mr. Hoover's part need another look at the record.

When Mr. Hoover says that his agents can go into any community and "identify" individuals and groups, what he means is that they can grab, collar, abduct, imprison, and otherwise physically apprehend human beings on a really grand and impressive scale. The moment the green light shows, it is doubtful that the excessive brutality of the Palmer Raids would be repeated, but the net effect of imprisoning thousands in mass arrests would be the same. The holding of an opinion, rather than proof of an illegal act, would be the basis for issuing arrest warrants.

The principal means of building up these lists of "subversives" has been the paid testimony of stool pigeons, the gratuitous information furnished by personal enemies, and the reports of Federal agents posing as members of suspected organizations. One former high Washington official I spoke with declared that he had a sure and painless method of causing the immediate financial collapse of the Communist Party. "How would you do that?" I asked him.

"Have the F.B.I. instruct its agents in the Communist Party to stop paying their dues."

Undercover agents are widely used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Laws, whether Federal or otherwise, are no barrier to their operation. Documents from the *Congressional Record* prove that, in its use of undercover agents, the Bureau, with the cooperation of officials of the Department of Justice, has broken Federal law covering the sending of ing parole or release of prisoners. Following is a letter from John W. Snook, former Warden of Atlanta Penitentiary:

"The practice under Mrs. Williebrandt (Maie Walker Williebrandt, Assistant Attorney General) was to cause agents to be convicted of fictitious crimes in the Federal courts and committed by Federal judges to Federal penal institutions. Such as, when Peter Hanson, afterwards known as convict No. 26206, Atlanta Penitentiary, was committed by Arthur J. Tuttle, District Judge, in Detroit, the commitment being certified under seal of the court. As a matter of fact, Peter Hanson was none other than William Larson, Agent of the Department of Justice. . . ."

"After the Agent, Larson, under the name of Hanson, was committed to Atlanta and remained there from January 6 to April 10, he was suddenly transferred by order of Mrs. Williebrandt from Atlanta to Leavenworth on April 10, 1923, and then again on order of

Mrs. Willebrandt he was released by Warden White on April 19, 1928. In other words, Mrs. Willebrandt arrogated to herself the judicial and presidential powers, in that at her will she caused the commitment of men to prison and at her order she ordered their release, disregarding the well-defined rules and principles covering parole and release. Her espionage system was nationally extended.

Referring to the case of convict Lloyd L. Miller, No. 22868 (a genuine convict at the time), transferred to Atlanta from Leavenworth and later paid off for his spying for the F.B.I. through having his sentence commuted, Warden Snook continues:

"This was one of a series of undercover operations which for one whole year had been in full blast at Leavenworth under orders of Mrs. Willebrandt which were executed by Thomas C. Wilcox, her agent, in the Bureau of Investigation."

After the spy system of Mrs. Willebrandt and the F.B.I. was exposed by the Atlanta Constitution, she received no official reprimand from any source, and subsequently caused another fraudulent commitment.

On the 21st day of February, 1929, with seeming regularity, I admitted at Atlanta Penitentiary a convict named Joseph Montana, alias John Mason, true name as it later developed, Fred J. Lackey, and actually a Department of Justice Agent. Montana had undergone incarceration by 13 days' service of his three-year sentence when, with the same suddenness as in the Hanson case, I was visited at the prison on March 6, 1929, by Thomas C. Wilcox, armed with an order from Mrs. Willebrandt directing me to release to Wilcox, F. J. Lackey, Special Agent, who, as Joseph Montana, was incarcerated in Atlanta Penitentiary. While reading her order I received a telegram, as follows:

"John W. Snook, Warden:
"Release Joseph Montana, who is Special Agent this Department, to T. C. Wilcox, Special Agent in Charge, Bureau of Investigation, Mitchell (Attorney-General)." as

An attempt was made to ascertain what Federal Judge, acting on whose orders, had illegally sentenced a man to prison. In reply to inquiries, a statement was obtained from Judge Hough, U. S. District Judge, Cincinnati, Ohio, who, on June 3, 1929, told the Chicago Tribune:

"That it was at the request of U. S. Judge Smith Hickenlooper, of the Circuit Court of Appeals, that he consented to sentence Lackey for a crime that had not in fact been committed. Judge Hickenlooper refused to answer any questions regarding the matter, saying it was none of the business of the press or public."

That is the type of answer familiar to a researcher attempting to understand the inner working of the Bureau of Investigation. Payment for stool-pigeons such as convict Lloyd Miller is assured by a section of the Federal Budget which, for 1947, set aside \$120,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended. This is a regular item on Federal Bureau of Investigation budgets, and appears every year.

Pinckton officials questioned by the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee stated that a system had been worked out through which government officials could be billed personally for labor spy services to circumvent the law against government hiring of private detectives, which was passed after the Homestead battle.

In 1938 the F.B.I. was alleged to have directed connections with the Cleveland Industrial Safety Council, a strike-breaking agency. In the spring of 1940, Reid Robinson, of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers

charged the Bureau had broken the local strike by descending in force on the union hall, arresting and holding incommunicado the strike leaders. The New York Post of September 10, 1940, disclosed that the F.B.I. was covering various C.I.O. meetings and noting license numbers of cars parked outside.

Nation's Business, in a December, 1947, article on prosecutions under the antitrust laws, takes heart in the fact that a number of unions are included in the proceedings:

"With those who do not cooperate, the F.B.I. is prepared to use all its ingenuity to obtain and identify records. . . in a recent case involving a West Coast union, it was fought at every turn. . . . However, the F.B.I. was able to locate copies of contracts and other papers which clearly indicated violations of the antitrust laws. But defense attorneys resorted to an extraordinary step—they refused to admit that the papers, taken from the union files, were those of the union."

How the papers were taken from the union files legally, deponent saith not. It is probably one of the many cases in which ingenuity replaces legality in the work of the G-Man.

On February 6, 1940, 40 G-Men were assigned to the Detroit office to assist in the dramatic before-dawn arrests of 11 persons charged with soliciting volunteers for the Spanish Loyalist Army, two years earlier. Houses were ransacked without search warrant; the prisoners were held incommunicado for nine or 10 hours. A lawyer was finally allowed to converse with the defendants in the presence of the Federal five minutes before they were taken into court. All the indictments were dismissed.²¹

"Business Finds G-Men are Admirationly Equipped to Assume Executive Roles, Especially in Dealing with Public and Labor." So reads a headline in Business Week for July 20, 1946, which goes on to say that John S. Bugas, formerly in charge of the Detroit office of the F.B.I., has been named head of labor relations at Ford's, replacing Harry Ben- neth, one of the biggest names in the American labor spy industry. Business Week reports that "By such subtle tactics as keeping the United Automobile Workers on the defensive, Bugas was able to institute favorable clauses into the company's U.A.W. contract."

A large number of former G-Men are employed by the union-busting employer's associations on the West Coast. Charles F. Ruck, who was head of the steel industry's espionage system, is another prominent graduate of J. Edgar Hoover's school. Several hundred ex-agents, most of them employed in various phases of "labor relations" are banded together in an organization calling itself, in lopsided accents, The Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., with headquarters at 70 Pine Street, New York City.

As to Hoover's personal attitude toward labor unions, he had an entire lodge of the AFL Federation of Government Employees thrown out of the International and out of the AFL for trying to organize the clerks employed by his Bureau. Turnover in some of the F.B.I. units has been claimed to exceed 70 percent in one year, with clerical employees eager to transfer to some other government agency at the first opportunity. Low wages, unpaid overtime, and semi-military working conditions were offered as some of the reasons for this attitude.

Hoover has opposed inclusion of his Bureau employees under Civil Service. In reply to his remarks, the Civil Service Commission said:

"Obviously, the principal difference between Mr. Hoover and the Civil Service Commission is that Mr. Hoover wants to operate a crime service personally and without regard to the democratic principles of open competition and equal opportunity."

It is worth remarking at this point that no colored employees have been seen in either the Washington headquarters or the New York office of the Bureau. A sympathetic writer claims that "a good handful" (out

of 3,500) of Special Agents are colored. The Worker's Defense League states that it knows of no such agent, and considers that the Bureau has been hampered in Southern civil rights cases by this lack.

In the Christian Front case, J. Edgar Hoover tried to make clear that the illegal operations of his Bureau were handled on an impartial basis and that at a time when Axis agents and sympathizers were unpopular, he would gladly break a few laws while cracking down on the Right. Eighteen men belonging to the Christian Front spent weeks in jail undicted, finally being held at \$50,000 bail each. The Bureau had in the newspapers photos taken of the men, and thoroughly tried the case.

Hoover gave a press conference in which he charged that the 18 men, if not apprehended by the vigilant work of the F.B.I., would have seized the nation's gold supply, power plants, telephone and telegraph systems, railway terminals, docks and government buildings. They were, he said, planning to blast bridges and bomb the New York Police Department, with 12 Congressmen thrown in for good measure.

VII. GESTAPO IN KNEE-PANTS

The acts of the Gestapo were in line with the general trends in German law under Hitler. The acts of the F.B.I. are being more and more frequently affirmed by American jurisprudence. Criticisms of civil rights violations, wire tapping, illegal entry and search, abduction and other questionable procedures are important as an indication of the temper of the Bureau and the willingness of its Director to overstep legal restrictions. The heart of that ignorance, however, is in the growing agreement between F.B.I. methods and the direction of Federal law as a whole. Executive orders, and recent Supreme Court decisions. One of the most important Supreme Court findings came in the George Harris case, where the Court held, 5 to 4, that Federal agents may enter a residence without a search warrant in cases where the suspect is arrested on the premises, and that they may thereafter make a search of the premises.

Since Hoover's men operate by making copious arrests—the F.B.I. arrests 10 persons for every seven it gets convictions for, according to the Brookings Institution—this decision opens up every door to them. The American's home may be his castle, but the drawbridge is down for J. Edgar & Co.

Since the decision in the Harris case, the *Truthman News* has reported that F.B.I. agents, investigating union members in connection with the murder of McNamara of the Toledo, Peoria and Western Railroad, have waited outside the railroad shops all day until a suspected union member finished work. They then tailed him home, waited about a few minutes until he was at supper, and subsequently entered the house to question him and search the premises. Obviously, the F.B.I. may be expected to make as many arrests as possible at the residence of future suspects.

The American Civil Liberties Union which, like the liberal weeklies, has gone soft on the F.B.I. of late years, seems to think the G-Men have become more scrupulous in their methods. Actually, what is happening is not so much a change of heart on their part as the tendency of the courts to make legal what formerly was illegal. Both the growth and the "legalization" of the F.B.I. in the last few years are symptomatic of the steady increase in State power which began under Roosevelt's New Deal.

The relation between the F.B.I. and the Federal courts cannot be considered a complete parallel with the Gestapo-German State System until the anonymous denunciation which is a major item in F.B.I. political cases becomes generally acceptable as evidence in the courts. It may also be noted that the very size of the United States, and its tendency toward statistic-worshipping make it seem unlikely that the

F.B.I. will easily resume its "old fashioned" brutality and develop on quite the same lines of unrestrained violence as the Nazi political police. With a view of crime which reduces the problem to one of arithmetic relationship between statistics about criminals and statistics about police officers and government agents, it is doubtful that the Federal Bureau will reach the level of personal vindictiveness and hatred evidenced in Germany. The Bureau, through no lack of eagerness on its part, is still a Gestapo in knee-pants.

Although anonymous denunciation is not yet accepted as evidence, the dossiers of the F.B.I. may influence courts and Federal agencies through the introduction of irrelevant and prejudicial material. Congressional committees have made use of such unworn evidence of an anonymous nature supplied by the Bureau, thus giving it the weight of Congressional sanction.

In the case of a young man who claimed exemption from military service as a conscientious objector, G-Men inferred that he was morally unsound because he had once taken part in a "strip-tease performance" and therefore, presumably, could not have been a bona fide conscientious objector. Investigation by a lawyer of the agent's basis for this report disclosed that the young man, while a high school student, had held the cloak of a fully-clad young lady while she sang at a school concert.²⁵

In these days of loyalty tests and investigations into political beliefs and affiliations, it is vital to remember that material introduced into a case from F.B.I. files cannot be contested by the defendant because of the Bureau's policy of labelling all sources as "confidential" and explaining that they cannot be named "for security reasons." Joseph Dugan, former Special Assistant to the Attorney General, when questioned on the availability for cross-examination of those giving statements for F.B.I. files, said, "It is the standard practice of the F.B.I. never to reveal the source of their information."²⁶

This shyness over the origin of damaging material, has been given official Federal sanction in the recent Executive Order of President Truman directing the Civil Service Commission and the F.B.I. to hunt subversives in Federal employment. The order provides, in Paragraph 2 of Part IV, that "... the investigative agency may refuse to disclose the names of confidential informants, provided ... it advises the requesting department or agency in writing that it is essential to the protection of the informants or to the investigation of other cases that the identity of the informants not be revealed."

In a letter to the *New York Times* of April 13, 1947, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., and other members of the faculty at Harvard Law School point out, in connection with Truman's Executive Order, that:

1. Anonymous denunciation is, for the first time, specifically provided for. (Here is one of the major instances in which Executive Order comes into line with a previous questionable policy of the F.B.I. and establishes it on the level of official government procedure.)

2. No provision is made for a record or transcript.

3. No provision is made that the evidence must support the findings of the loyalty board.

4. "Sympathetic association," not proved membership in a subversive group, is held sufficient to determine disloyalty of an individual.

Following this complaint by the Harvard group, and similar complaints from Yale and other legal circles holding to the "old-fashioned" legal concepts of fair and open trial, President Truman announced a number of "democratic" furishes, trimmings and interpretations designed to make the loyalty investigations somewhat more palatable to the legal profession. None of these, however, mitigated in the slightest any of the four criticisms made by the Harvard group.

To override once and for all any complaints about the extra-legal

aspects of the investigations and dismissals, Senator Patrick McCarran tackled an amendment to the State Department Appropriation Bill which provided that the department may discharge anyone it wishes without stating reason. This amendment also grants the armed forces and the Atomic Energy Commission the right to fire without obligation to prefer written charges or grant hearings, in cases where exceptional aspects of national security are concerned. It is generally understood in the government services that there are few cases left where exceptional aspects of national security are not concerned.

The House bill approved during the week of July 13, 1947, is more stringent than Truman's Executive Order. It establishes a Federal Loyalty Review Board from which there is no appeal. A motion by Rep. Estes Kefauver to send the bill back to committee for inclusion of the right to court appeal was defeated, 248 to 133.

The list of subversive organizations compiled from the F.B.I. index and released by Attorney General Clark, and on the basis of which numerous dismissals from government service have been made, was already out of date at the time of its release. According to the *New York Times* of December 6, 1947, the list included a number of organizations which no longer existed, and which had been defunct for some time. The headlines listed in the *Times Index* tell the story of seven discharged employees of the State Department who tried to obtain a formal hearing on the charges which resulted in their firing, late in 1947, from General Marshall's hallway.

November 3: State Department denies plea for formal hearing of seven discharged employees or for permission to retire without prejudice.

November 4: Group seeks Secretary Marshall conference; violation of Bill of Rights seen.

November 6: Marshall refuses hearing; says group can appeal to Loyalty Review Board.

November 10: Civil Service Commission gets hearing request.

November 14: Group again asks Marshall for hearing; attorney reports Commission assertion that dismissal was under McCarran Amendment and not within Loyalty Review Board jurisdiction.

November 18: State Department reverses stand; permits group to resign without prejudice.

The important point is that none of the accused ever received a hearing. All were discharged for holding opinions or committing acts of an unspecified nature, set forth in papers too confidential, ever to be produced or even proved to exist, and containing allegations of anonymous persons. At least one individual, discharged, on attempting to secure employment with a university, found that the prospective employer had been informed by the State Department that the applicant was considered to be a bad security risk.

Faced with this accusation, which has neither head nor body, is connected to no ascertainable person, against which there is no more recourse than against a fog, the individual must feel as hopelessly caught as the concentration-camp inmate, described in David, Rousseau's "The Other Kingdom."

"The destiny of the concentrationary universe is inconceivably remote. Measureless expanses of laws and offices, of meandering corridors and stacks of papers, where a whole genus of office workers, preoccupied and pale, lives and dies, human typewriters, isolating the camp and letting nothing leak through to the outside world except a vague and awesome terror of inhuman realms. At the center of this empire, forever invisible, a brain unifies and controls all the police resources. Towering walls of pigeonholes, skyscrapers of dossiers, the most trivial matters catalogued. . . From these offices comes a signature, the order of life or death for the concentrationary. . . because of a dead life, often one abandoned months or even years ago, and which seemed to have already been judged. There a case is never finished, never closed. The trial goes on."

expands, fattens on personages born of itself, without any reason ever being formulated."

The employees fired by the State Department had been employed from three to five years by various government agencies. Most of them had been cleared for top secret work. In all previous employment they were presumably cleared by the F.B.I., War Department, Civil Service Commission or the Office of Strategic Services. Three of them had never been questioned by any agents of the State Department or by any investigator from any other agency. Counsel for the seven charged that the State Department had ignored its own statement on security principles (Department Announcement 765), and that no charges had ever been submitted to the individuals concerned or to their counsel. Counsel stated that "the procedure that has been followed is tragically analogous to the tactics employed in the police states dominated by Communists and fascists and has no place in the American system. . . ."

Lovett, of the State Department, replying to counsel stated that "This determination (to fire) was based upon evidence which the department is not able to disclose for reasons of national security." Secretary of State Marshall declared in a news conference that the department's action "was in large part based on highly classified material not under its control, and in the circumstances a full statement of the charges could not be made to the employees." He asserted that a true hearing was impossible, and refused to identify the source of the information.

Even in its provision for appeal to the Loyalty Review Board established under Executive Order 9835, the accepted legal provision that burden of proof rests upon the plaintiff, and that the defendant shall be considered innocent until proved guilty, is utterly disregarded. When and if the accused is finally heard, "The purpose of such appeal will be to permit the employee affirmatively to establish his loyalty." Although the President's declaration on loyalty tests and investigations denounces rumor, gossip and suspicion as insufficient evidence, we have seen that this is precisely what constitutes the bulk of an F.B.I. dossier.

Clifford J. Durr, a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, speaking in Chicago on October 26, 1947, charged that unsolicited information on employees, was being forwarded to Federal agencies by the F.B.I. Hoover promptly wrote a letter to the Commission implying that, if the other Commissioners did not disavow Durr, the F.C.C. would receive no further information of any sort from his Bureau. Of course, the Commissioners hastened to follow Mr. Hoover's lead, and it is now held most unlikely that Durr will receive re-appointment when his current term expires.

On January 11, 1948, a group of 33 prominent Americans made public a letter to the Loyalty Review Board in which they said:

"We regard the procedures set forth in the order as lacking adequate safeguards in

(1) not requiring full revelation of the charges, with production of witnesses and documents and the right of cross-examination; (2) in the use of such ill-defined words as 'subversive,' 'totalitarian,' and 'sympathetic association;' and (3) in the lack of any provision for hearings of organizations blacklisted who protest their inclusion."

In addition to highlighting the increasing agreement between the F.B.I. methods and the attitudes of the Executive, Legislative and Judiciary divisions of the Federal government, these loyalty cases affirm the charges made against the F.B.I. by Senator Norris. The Senator claimed that the Bureau, under Hoover, had been guilty of installing a secret political spy system, conducting improper liaison with employers in investigating the non-criminal activities of their workers, and re-introducing the card-indexes of radicals and others, based on opinion, not conduct.

At the time he appointed J. Edgar Hoover head of the F.B.I., then Attorney-General Harlan Stone remarked: "The Bureau of Investigation is not concerned with political or other opinions of individuals. It is concerned only with their conduct and then only with such conduct as is forbidden by the laws of the United States. When a police system passes beyond these limits, it is dangerous to the proper administration of justice and to human liberty."

The Civil Service Commission reports that 811 persons were dismissed from government service for "disloyalty" in the period from July 1, 1946 to March 31, 1947. A *New York Times* dispatch of July 17 states that only 158 were specifically "ineligible for employment for loyalty involving Communism." "No other sort of subversive disloyalty was specifically described," says the dispatch.

VIII. THE AMERICAN POLICE STATE

Many liberals believe that the police state will not have arrived in America until some military officer, resplendent in full uniform and medals rides a white horse dramatically up the front steps of the Capitol and proclaims the establishment of Fascism. These liberals forget that, to expect a March on Washington, a Mussolini, or a Reichstag fire, is Hitler is to ignore the invincible capacity, the ability for innovation, of the home-grown American reactionary. America's blueprint for the police state is being drawn up today in the Senate and House Appropriation Committees.

Social Services of the Federal government in the 1949 Budget, including the National Health Program, Federal aid to education, subsidies for low-cost housing, and additional benefits under Social Security, total just 1 percent of the budget. Repeating their performance for the last two years, these committees, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, cut 28 percent from the Commerce Department estimate. The State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs had asked for \$31,000,000. It got nothing. Even the Department of Justice took a cut of about 1 percent—but not that portion of the Justice Department which is under J. Edgar Hoover. The Federal Bureau of Investigation got every cent it asked for—\$43,900,000.

In 1947, the State, Commerce and Justice Departments took a cut on the proposed 1948 budget averaging 23 percent. Again, Hoover got all he asked for. It was \$38,000,000 a year ago.

Time magazine for May, 1947, commenting on the 1948 budget, remarks that "The Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has a standard routine for appropriations committees. First, he sweats members to secrecy. Then he tells them what his F.B.I. is doing to keep such things as crime and the menace of U. S. Communism in check."

In every Congress, some legislative is on hand with a carefully prepared report giving the glorified history of the Bureau and its Director, which is read into the *Congressional Record*, complete with credits to the F.B.I. for solving crimes actually tracked by other government agencies. When the funds voted by Congress do not prove to be sufficient for Mr. Hoover's needs during the year, he builds up a deficit which the Congress is then asked to vote additional money to cover.

"Mr. Woodrum of Virginia, I think it (F.B.I.) has been a very useful agency of the government, but I think that every agency of the government ought to handle its fiscal affairs in an orderly and logical way, and should not be permitted to expand its functions unless it has the authority of Congress to do so."

"Mr. O'Brien: Has this particular branch, to the gentleman's knowledge, been guilty of such action?"

"Mr. Woodrum: Yes, it employed people right here who will have to be discharged unless we give this money. That is the difficulty about it." 26

The Director of the Bureau is not averse to using his Special Agents for lobbying purposes. In 1933, when he had good reason to believe he would be fired by the incoming Attorney-General Walsh, he called in a large number of his agents from many states to lobby with their Senators in his behalf—and at government expense.

Whatever the temperament and methods of Mr. Hoover, it must be remembered that he could not carry on in his traditional style for one day under an Attorney-General or an administration which disapproved his ways.

Mr. Hoover and his heresy-hunting Bureau do not stand alone. Solidly behind them are the American reactionaries and conservatives, busily constructing the American Police State by stripping to the skeleton all departments of the Federal government except the military and the internal security police. They are anxious to assign John Edgar Hoover the role of the American Himmler—with the necessary American changes in the script.

And Mr. Hoover, like Markus, is willing, me'am.

REFERENCES

1. *The Nation*, March 6, 1937.
2. *Only Yesterday*, Frederick Lewis Allen; Harpers.
3. *Congressional Record*, 71st Congress, 3rd Sess., House, Jan. 22, 1931.
4. *Onstead v. the United States* (177 U. S. 438).
5. *New Yorker*, October 11, 1941.
6. *Congressional Record*, 71st Congress, 3rd Sess., House, Jan. 22, 1931.
7. *Current Biography*, 1940.
8. *The Freeman*, January 9, 1934.
9. Hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Jan. 19-March 3, 1931.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Cocher v. Steffington* (265 Fed. 17)
13. *The Sacco-Vanzetti Case*, American Trials Series; Osmond K. Fraenkel; Knopf.
14. *Collier's*, April 12, 1947.
15. *The Nation*, March 6, 1937
16. *also Current Biography*, 1940.
17. *The Nation*, February 27, 1936, and March 6, 1937.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Newsweek*, August 22, 1938.
20. *Harpers's January*, 1936.
21. *Starting Farnsworth*, by Wm. Mangill.
22. *New Republic*, March 11, 1940.
23. *Literary Digest*, May 31, 1924.
24. *Congressional Record*, 71st Congress, 3rd Sess., February 18, 1931.
25. *New Republic*, March 11, 1940.
26. National Service Board for Religious Objectors: Case of Harold V. Rusner.
27. Statement of N.S.B.R.O. Attorney Leonard Lazarus.
28. *New York Times*, November 6, 1947.
29. *Congressional Record*, 76 Congress, House, March 22, 1939.

(All major sources not otherwise indicated are official publications of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the speeches of J. Edgar Hoover, and the *New York Times* on file at the New York Public Library.)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius
A CHASTE "RIBALD SONG"

A reader sends along a newspaper repetition of the familiar story that during the French Revolution there was so wild a scene in the great cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris, on November 10, 1793, that a prostitute was cheered when she mounted the high (or chief) altar and sang blasphemous and obscene songs. My publications have shown repeatedly that this is not merely a lie but a travesty as far from the truth as is conceivable. But this latest reteller of the lie professed to have high academic authority. He quotes Dr. W. S. Davis saying in his "Europe Since Waterloo" (1926) that "in 1793 a light woman had been encouraged as she screamed a ribald song from the high altar of Notre Dame in Paris during a festival to Reason."

Dr. Davis (Doctor of Philosophy) wrote a number of works on European history, and there can be little doubt that his large and pretentious "Europe Since Waterloo" has a place in the libraries of all colleges and universities in America. He is what is called in these days a sound man. He says in the preface that he wrote the book "from a matured belief that only as the spirit of Christianity penetrates the hearts of all men will human brotherhood and widespread enduring happiness be achieved." And nearly on his first page he reproduces religious and political reasons, a lie that has been refuted hundreds of times, and which in 10 minutes he could have found to be a lie: a lie to discredit popular revolutions.

The myth is that you would have been bored to death if you had lived in Paris in the latter part of 1793. Religious and puritanical Robespierre was taking the lead. Atheism was beginning to be hunted as Communism now is. Even the workers walked in solemn processions singing "hymns," as they called them, to Liberty, to Innocence, to Virtue. Robespierre had not yet decreed that everybody must worship God, under threat of the guillotine, but it was at a discount. Mostly, all over France, the spirit expended itself in Feasts of Liberty. The brilliant French historian Michelet, who wrote the first full history of the Revolution 100 years ago, tells us that when the plan of such feasts was discussed the first idea was to have a statue carved to represent Liberty, but they decided that there was a risk of a new cult of a Virgin Mary and directed that at each feast Liberty must be represented by a girl, beautiful if possible, but certainly virtuous. He reproduces the instruction sent out, that "for so august a function they must choose persons whose beauty is enhanced by their character," and it was done.

The Parisians, when their turn came, decided to make it a Feast of Liberty and of Reason, in memory of the great philosophers (Rousseau, etc.), but they scrupulously followed the directions. Michelet, who was near enough to the events to interview one of the Women—a severe spinster—concludes that the Paris festival was "chaste, cold, dry, and a bore." The lady chosen was, he says, Mlle. Malland, a proper and severe artist of the Opera Company which arranged the pageant. The

28

altars were screened off—the bishops and clergy had handed over the cathedral and quit their functions long before—and it was in a large model of a Greek temple that Mlle. Malland appeared. She did not represent Reason but Liberty. She was not supposed to be the Goddess of Liberty but called on the goddess, rhetorically, to "come down" and bless the French people. She sang nothing, but solemnly recited a "hymn" composed by the chief poet of the time, M. J. Chénier. This was "An Ode to Chastity." I have this "hymn to Liberty" which was printed at the time, and for the convenience of readers I give this translation:

Come down, O Liberty, daughter of Nature;
The people have regained their immortal power
Over the pompous remains of the ancient imposture—
Their hands raise thy altars once more.

Come, Conquerors of Kings, Europe rewards you;
Come, extend your success over the false Gods.
Do thou, Holy Liberty, come and dwell in thy temple.
Be thou the Goddess of the French.

The sight of thee rejoices the wildest hills
And brings forth harvests on the barren rocks.
Adorned by thy hands, the most hideous share
Shines with a crown of icicles.

Twofold dost thou make pleasures, Virtues, genius;
Under thy holy banner man always triumphs.
He knows not life until he knows thee,
Thy smiles create him.

All Kings war against the sovereign people,
At thy feet, O Goddess, they henceforth fall.
Soon the peoples of the earth shall swear eternal peace
Over the grave of tyrants.

Warriors of Liberty, brave and powerful race,
Armed with a human blade, sanctify fear,
Smitten by your blows, soon the last slave
Shall follow the last King to the tomb.

Yes, it makes your blood cold rather than hot. The last two lines alone lived and have been repeated thousands of times by American orators. How many who peated them out on the 4th of July suspected that they were from the "ribald song," the "obscene blasphemy," which they read in their history books, a prostitute screened from an altar in a venerable cathedral? There had been no obscenity in Notre Dame since the power of the Church had been broken at the Reformation. But at the Feast of Fools and other festivals there had been plenty, several times a year, for five centuries before that, with the clergy joyously taking part.

♦ ♦ ♦

GETTING DOWN TO FOUNDATIONS

Some pretty stuff has been written or said ever since the days of Pythagoras—and in India long before that—on the triumphs of mind over matter and the need to deal severely with the appetites of the flesh so that the mind might deploy its full strength and its vision would not be obscured by the fumes of carnal satisfactions. Pious scholars (Origen, etc.) cut off their—shall we say tonsils?—so that they might not be distracted from the pursuit of wisdom by these miserable things.

29

the flesh. Monks (Simeon Stylites, etc.) lived for years eating, sleeping, and everything else) on the summits of tall columns. Other monks (of Mount Athos) contemplated their nude navel (and they never washed) for hours together in the weird belief that this helped them to forget the body.

Men starved themselves, flogged themselves, refused to bathe themselves, wore hair shirts, denied themselves sleep, and perpetrated a hundred other idiotic heroisms in order to keep the flame of the mind burning brightly. They even, from Pythagoras onward, liquidated the Sybarites round about them in order to purify the atmosphere. And the amount of wisdom these self-mortifiers have put together since the first Hindu wisdom-seekers began to sit on racks or spend years in solitude could today be written on a postcard and leave room for a few caustic remarks.

There were others who made the surprising discovery that if you gave the body, in moderation, the comforts that it craves for you somehow gave the mind greater vitality. Francis of Assisi called his body "Brother Ass" and he beat it mercilessly and tossed it about in thorn-bushes; and the modern world regards his ideas as amiably childish. Aristotle, on the contrary, fully appreciated a good dinner and sinuous Greek girls like his pretty Herpyllis, and the modern world regards him as one of the wisest men of old times. Most philosophers agreed with him that balance—a sound mind in a sound body—was desirable, but they still considered the mind the source of truth; and all that they have discovered in 2,000 years is stored in that section of the library which is labelled philosophy—and few people ever look at it.

At last John Locke started the cry that the mind has no truth that did not come to it through the senses, or through a normally-treated body and after two or three centuries of struggle it is generally agreed that he was right. Few even of our modern psychologists, who cut out the word mind, are bold enough to say that it is brain that does the work, though that is the upshot of their teaching. The brain is like a camera. Close the shutters, the eyes and ears, and the screen is blank. Open them, and the universe is mirrored on the screen. But the human brain is no passive, inert screen. It is prodigiously active, and the elements fed to it, the sense perceptions, pass from level to level, becoming more and more abstract and wider until, by some obscure alchemy, we get ideas as elaborate as Relativity or Evolution.

The weakness of this higher thinking power of the human brain is that it so easily accepts the false as well as the true; and since everybody began to react and to get his "ideas" ready-made from outside, he gets more falsehood than ever. A French philosopher, Descartes, once seriously considered this problem. He decided to sweep out the whole contents of his mind and then critically build up a structure of pure truth. After much cogitation he decided that the one sure and indisputable foundation was, "I think, therefore I exist." As a matter of fact, all that he was fundamentally conscious of is that thought exists, and nobody yet knows what thought really is. So the determined philosopher soon went astray. "Thought" is obviously spiritual, he said, so the "I" that thinks is a spiritual and immortal mind. How was it connected with the body? It lives, he said, in the "pneual body"; a curious object, shaped like a nut, in the center of the brain. In point of fact, it is the least active of all the parts of the brain. It is probably the shrunk remainder of an eye in the top of the head of one of our remote ancestors. So Descartes' structure of pure truth was as adulterated as anybody else's.

There is no need whatever for these profound considerations. Most people today do not form ideas. They buy them. Most of them come from the newspapers, books, and speeches, and although it is an elementary counsel of common sense that you should take care that the person whose ideas you buy knows what he is talking about and has no reason either to suppress or distort truth, it is remarkable how few

follow it. Most people will have read, for instance, that on 11 years of film star, Margaret O'Brien, who is not yet able to spell, contribute over our time that it pays editors to pay large sums to film stars, baseball players, pugilists, etc., to give their names to articles which, even a third school boy must know, they never wrote; and their ideas would not have the slightest value if they did. Such is the press which today rules the planet. A newspaper is a mechanism by means of which a rich man enforces his opinions on a million men and women, mainly through ghost writers. Everybody knows that when he is reading his paper he is absorbing, on important matters, the ideas of a man or an organization that happens to be rich; and few can doubt if a score of these paper-owning millionaires were put through an examination in economics (the home affairs) and the realities of European life they could easily be beaten by a score of mechanics. So instead of digging down to the foundations of your thinking, remember that it is, as a rule, not *your* thinking at all and carefully check the authority and disinterestedness of the man whom you trust to do your thinking.

THE HOMELESS GHOSTS

We worry a good deal just now about Displaced Persons but it is curious that no one ever has a word of concern about the millions of Displaced Ghosts that have lost their homes—often residences that have been in the ghostly family for centuries—in all this ghost-hunting or psychical research of the last 100 years. To that time no castle had the genuine aristocratic aroma unless it had a ghost that walked the battlements at night or dragged its chains along the corridors. Any town was an upstairs that had not a haunted house, while in country manors and mansions they were as indispensable as watchdogs. There were gay ghosts in silks and ruffles, ghosts of unhappy maids swathed in ample folds of linen, armored ghosts whose clangor made the servants pull the blankets over their eyes; victims with their heads under their arms, moaners, clowners, nuns, friars, and so on, but never a nude ghost. You got more money for your house if it had an authentic ghost, just as if it had a trout stream or an Italian garden.

Spiritualist meetings this year forcibly remind us of the spiritual annihilation that we have witnessed. Meeting after meeting has been held, with terrific solemnity, to tempt two particular ghosts to step back among us from whatever region they have taken refuge in. The spirits of Margareta and Katie Fox, in a sense the founders of modern Spiritualism, were implored to encourage their fans by putting in a personal appearance. One wonders why their elder sister Leah, the real founder of the movement was coldly ignored. This modern "hands across the sea"—or across the boundary between the two worlds—began in 1848 in a farmhouse at Hydesville in New York State. On a farm in what was then the Wild North were two lively little girls, Maggie Fox, aged 15, and Katie, aged 12. Mysterious noises are often heard from the bedrooms of girls of that age, but the systematic knocking that was heard night after night was different. Father and mother, then neighbors, stood in the room while the girls lay quiet in bed, but the knocks went on. They devised a code and asked if the knocker was not the soul of a murdered man who had been buried in that spot; and the answer, surprising to say, was Yes. The fame of the little village-mediums spread, and the elder sister Leah decided that there was "gold in them thar hills." Spiritualism was born, and within a few years there were 4,000,000 Spiritualists in hard-headed America, even professors accepting the stories of levitations, of pianos resting on eggs, of phantoms

trumpbone and clarinet players, and so on; and within 10 years or so the innocent foxes were rich.

Leah, who was the St. Paul—or, if you prefer it, Pauline—of the movement is permitted to linger in peace wherever she is, but it was felt safe to bring back Maggie and Kate to rebuke our materialistic age and teach us how to lambaste the Bolsheviks to our hearts' content yet escape retaliation. And if you want any further proof that our age is not materialistic, which is the same thing as realistic, it is there. For if we had the concern for facts which a good Materialist always has we could easily find out, and the papers could have pointed it out, that Maggie Fox or Kane—she married the famous Arctic explorer—and her sister were not only crooks but had publicly confessed it in New York. In the '80's there was a furious family quarrel. The two ladies who had been in communication with the spirits for 40 years were now devoting themselves to a different brand of spirits, and Leah thought they might blurt out the truth, so she had Maggie's children removed from her. So Maggie in an interview with a reporter from the *Herald* (which published the confession on September 24, 1888) admitted that it all had been "trud" from the start. She called a meeting at the New York Academy of Music and showed the audience how she and Kate produced the ghostly raps by cracking the joints of their toes; and Kate, who had just returned from England, supported her. That meeting is reported in the *Herald* for October 10th, and both reports are reproduced in R. B. Davenport's "Death-Blow to Spiritualism" (1888).

Such is our system of public instruction that the "religion" went on prospering and is, apparently, still much alive. A Psychological Research Society appeared, and its learned representatives solemnly spent nights in hundreds of haunted houses. Ghost was now a discredited word in an enlightened age. The professors said that conceivably there might be a Poltergeist (which means the same thing in German) playing these pranks in particularly sensitive houses. But they heard never a groan or the faintest clank of chains. Did that finish the business? Not in the least. There died in London in March, 1948, a Mr. Harry Price, once one of the smartest conjurers in Britain, later a professional Psychological Researcher. And chatty journalists, commenting on the close of his remarkable career, said that for many years any man who had wanted to hunt for poltergeists in one of the few houses that still make a pretence to harbor a few in their dark corners had to pay Mr. Price. A corner in haunted houses is surely a novelty, blending the material and the spiritual worlds with a frivolity that is only too possible in this age of ours.